6

The Lover Reflected in the *Exemplum*: A Study of Propertius 1. 3 and 2. 6

FRANCIS M. DUNN

A mythology reflects its region. Here
In Connecticut, we never lived in a time
When mythology was possible—But if we had—
That raises the question of the image's truth.
The image must be of the nature of its creator.
It is the nature of its creator increased,
Heightened. It is he, anew, in a freshened youth
And it is he in the substance of his region,
Wood of his forests and stone out of his fields
Or from under his mountains.

Wallace Stevens[1]

Like every other aspect of his poetry, Propertius' use of mythology has been widely debated.[2] The frequency and variety with which mythological allusions occur in the elegies[3] raise a number of ques-

[1] Wallace Stevens, "A Mythology Reflects its Region," in *The Palm at the End of the Mind*, ed. by Holly Stevens (New York 1972), p. 398.

[2] A useful summary of the bibliography from 1838 to 1965 is given by Godo Lieberg in "Die Mythologie des Properz in der Forschung und die Idealisierung Cynthias," *Rheinisches Museum* 112 (1969), 311–47 (=Lieberg 1969). The works cited are divided according to their view of Propertius' use of myth: Gruppe (1838), Denne-Baron (1850), Benda (1928), Schanz–Hosius (1935) and Rostagni (1956) are negative; Haupt (1876), Plessis (1884), Rothstein (1898), La Penna (1951), Desideri (1958) and Luck (1961) are mixed; and Hertzberg (1843), Heinze (1918), Schöne (1911), Allen (1939), Alfonsi (1945), Boyancé (1953), Kölmel (1957), Grimal (1963) and Boucher (1965) are favorable. More recent studies include Macleod (1974), Sullivan (1976), La Penna (1977), Lechi (1979), Lyne (1980), Verstraete (1980), Bollo Testa (1981) and Whitaker (1983). Full references will be given below when these works are cited.

[3] A catalogue of all the occurrences and the ways in which they are introduced is given by Wilhelm Schöne in *De Propertii ratione fabulas adhibendi* (Leipzig 1911). A

tions: for example, how much does the use of myth owe to the influence of Greek literature,[4] and how far did it become a vehicle for Augustan propaganda?[5] But the question most often raised, and to which this paper will give a partial answer, concerns the role which mythology plays within the poems. In general, critics have given three types of answers, namely, (a) that references to mythology provide ornament and coloring; (b) that they bestow authority and a sense of truth; and (c) that they are formal poetic devices. These categories are not mutually exclusive,[6] nor do critics of Propertius always favor one interpretation over the others.[7] Yet much of the discussion concerning mythology in Propertius seems to center on the opposition between (a) and (b). Thus Gruppe (1838) regarded myth as "ein fremder Zierath und völlig aüsserlicher Schmuck,"[8] while Hertzberg (1843) opposed such a view[9] and emphasized the poet's literal acceptance of mythology.[10] More recently, Allen (1962) opposed the view of mythology as decorative[11] when he argued for its role in bestowing authority:

> In primitive societies it is a function of myth to provide authoritative sanction for custom and belief. In an advanced society it may remain as

---

catalogue of important occurrences in Greek and Latin poetry is given by H. V. Canter in "The mythological paradigm in Greek and Latin poetry," *American Journal of Philology* 54 (1933), 201–24.

[4] For an excellent discussion see Pierre Boyancé, "Properce," in *L'influence grecque sur la poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 2, Vandoeuvres–Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1956) (=Boyancé 1956).

[5] See Maria Luisa Angrisani, *Properzio tra politica e mitologia* (Quaderni della Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale 15, Rome 1974).

[6] Boyancé 1956 (n. 4), for example, regards myth as an ornamental element, "une surcharge d'érudition," which is appropriated by the poet as a formal device and "permet au contraire au poète de mieux exprimer sa personnalité" (p. 193).

[7] Thus J. P. Sullivan (*Propertius: A critical introduction* [Cambridge 1976]) defines the three functions of mythology in poetry as narrative, symbolic and ornamental. Sullivan suggests that Propertius usually uses myth symbolically, but often lapses into excessive use of myth as ornament (pp. 132–33).

[8] O. F. Gruppe, *Die römische Elegie*, Leipzig 1838 (the citation is from Lieberg 1969 [n. 2], p. 312).

[9] "Fabularum autem usus longe diversus in oratione pedestri atque in carmine. Illic enim ornatus saepe gratia adscitae inter figuras rhetoricas referuntur; hic ipsius sunt argumenti pars," Wilhelm Hertzberg, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Elegiarum Libri Quattuor*, 3 vols. (Halis 1843–45), vol. 1, p. 72.

[10] "[N]on vanae sunt et exsangues figurae, sed quae sanctorum somniorum et deorum immortalium fide satis roboris atque nervorum accipiant," Hertzberg (n. 9), vol. 1, p. 77.

[11] Immediately before the passage quoted below he says "The question which requires consideration is this: Is mythology simply a decorative and ennobling element or is it an essential part of his poetry?"

> a body of universally respected truth, establishing the validity of the fundamental assumptions upon which the ordering of society is based. . . . Since Propertius, like Cicero, regarded myth as symbolically true, as providing known and accepted examplification [sic] of known and accepted principles, he found in myth a means of expressing universal and absolute truth, a standard of validity more real than any single and isolated experience.[12]

Lyne (1980) in his turn reacted against this emphasis on the truth-value of myth[13] by presenting a new statement of its ornamental function:

> It was *un*truth rather than absolute truth: attractive fiction to brighten the tedious truth of house walls and everyday lives. The myths opened on to a fabulous world: a world of *fabulae*, where beings more beautiful, attractive, or terrible than real beings lived lives out of this world; a *romantic* world, in a defined sense.[14]

The opposition between these two interpretations[15] is most clearly expressed by the contrast between the "universal truth" of Allen and the "untruth" of Lyne. Yet however much they differ concerning the truth or untruth of the mythical world, both agree in one important respect. Both interpretations regard this mythical world as external to the poem, and as giving to the poem (which is otherwise complete) a greater degree of validity. In one case this is the validity of universal truth, and in the other the validity of romantic fantasy; but in both interpretations this mythical world provides an objective standard shared by the poet and the reader, a common ground to which the poet can appeal to give his poem greater depth and authority.

The third approach to this question follows a different tack altogether. In fact the issue of the truth of the mythical world becomes irrelevant if we regard it as a formal device, as simply a means of poetic expression. Rothstein (1898) argued that in his use of

[12] P. 130 in Archibald W. Allen, "Sunt qui Propertium malint," in *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, ed. by J. P. Sullivan (Cambridge, Mass. 1962), pp. 107–48.

[13] A few lines before the passage quoted below he says "[Classical myths] did not offer a 'means of expressing universal and absolute truth,' as some scholars think," quoting the same passage in Allen.

[14] R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford 1980) (=Lyne 1980), p. 86.

[15] Both Hertzberg (note 9 above) and Allen (note 12 above) suggest that our choice must be one or the other. View (a) is represented also by S. Desideri in "Il preziosismo mitologico di Properzio," *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 11 (1958), 327–36. View (b) is argued also by Luck, p. 122 (Georg Luck, *The Latin Love-Elegy*, 2nd ed., London 1969), and Grimal, p. 195: "il finit par découvrir la valeur divine, ontologique, de l'amour" (Pierre Grimal, *L'Amour à Rome*, Paris 1979).

mythology Propertius "zeigt . . . sich gerade darin als der eigentliche Vollender der Dichtungsgattung," and concluded:

> es ist ein wichtiger und bezeichnender Unterschied zwischen der modernen Erotik und der des Properz, dass diese vorwiegend durch die als belebt und mitempfindend vorgestellte Natur, die des Properz durch Erinnerung an Schöpfungen der Kunst den Kreis ihrer Darstellung zu erweitern sucht.[16]

This view of mythology as an element of poetic technique was developed more fully by Alfonsi (1945)[17] and Boucher (1965),[18] resulting, as Lieberg observes, in "eine radikale Umwertung."[19] Indeed recent studies on mythology in Propertius[20] tend to follow the procedure announced by Whitaker: "In general I shall simply take for granted that mythological exempla are an integral part of the elegists' poems. My central concern will be rather the *manner* in which each of the elegists employs myth."[21] The emphasis of these studies varies considerably, from a rhetorical (Lechi[22]) to a statistical approach (Bollo Testa[23]), yet all are reacting against the view, implicit in the previous interpretations, that mythology is something external to the poem.[24] The result is a shift towards the other extreme:[25]

[16] Max Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* (Berlin 1898), p. xxxvi.

[17] Luigi Alfonsi, *L'elegia di Properzio* (Pubblicazioni dell'Univ. Cattolica del S. Cuore, n.s. 7, Milan 1945) (=Alfonsi 1945).

[18] Jean-Paul Boucher, *Études sur Properce* (Paris 1965).

[19] Lieberg 1969 (n. 2), p. 319.

[20] For example Verstraete begins: "As has been better recognized by critics over the last few decades, Propertius uses his images and illustrations from the world of myth as a real and often brilliantly imaginative reflection of the multiple permutations of his experience," p. 259 in B. C. Verstraete, "Propertius' use of myth in Book Two," *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 2, ed. by Carl Deroux (Collection Latomus 168, Brussels 1980), pp. 259–68.

[21] Richard Whitaker, *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy* (Hypomnemata 76, Göttingen 1983), p. 14.

[22] Francesca Lechi, "Testo mitologico e testo elegiaco. A proposito dell'exemplum in Properzio," *Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 3 (1979), 83–100.

[23] Cristina Bollo Testa, "Funzione e significato del mito in Properzio. Interpretazione di dati statistici," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura classica* 37 (n.s. 8, 1981), 135–54.

[24] Thus Bollo Testa (n. 23): "l'uso del mito in Properzio . . . non è infatti un elemento estraneo, giustapposto, ma nasce e si muove con il mutare dell'ispirazione" (p. 141), and Whitaker (n. 21): "mythology is by no means something extraneous to Roman love-elegy, but is on the contrary very closely bound up with both its main purposes and essential elements of its style" (p. 14). Compare also Kölmel, p. 3 (Bernward Kölmel, *Die Funktion des Mythologischen in der Dichtung des Properz*, Diss. Heidelberg 1957), Macleod, p. 82 (C. W. Macleod, "A use of myth in ancient poetry," *Classical Quarterly* 24 [1974], 82–93), and Verstraete (n. 20), p. 261.

[25] This is clearest in Bollo Testa (n. 23) and Whitaker (n. 21), whose discussions center on the various formal relations between myth and context.

mythology is viewed simply as one of many formal devices by which the poet's meaning is expressed. Rather than a source of truth or a source of untruth, it is a neutral medium which the poet may exploit as he pleases. The myth conveys this larger meaning, but has no meaning, no independent function of its own.

As was noted above, these three interpretations are not mutually exclusive. It would be astonishing if they were, and surprising if in using myth as form (that is, in using it as a poetic device) Propertius did not also make full use of its content (namely its power to convey authority and coloring). Although Boucher is primarily interested in mythology as a means of expression,[26] he notes that this expression must be indirect, since the world of myth also has a life of its own:

> La mythologie constitue un autre monde riche et complexe où se trouvent des êtres connus, caractérisés par leurs aventures, constitués en personnages qui ont une réalité propre: elle fournit à l'élégiaque un moyen d'expression indirecte.[27]

In reading a given elegy we must take into account all three kinds of interpretation.[28]

I intend to show in the following sections of this paper that one of the ways in which myth becomes an important means of expression for Propertius is by an original and rather surprising manipulation of its other role as an objective standard of truth. Rather than referring to an independent and external world, and thus providing added color or authority, it refers instead to the subjective experience of the lover. In the first poem we will look at (1. 3), a series of mythical exempla purports to describe the poet's mistress, but instead describes the situation and feelings of the lover. In the second poem (2. 6) a similar series of exempla seems to introduce a condemnation of the poet's mistress, but reveals instead the conflicting feelings of the lover. In both cases mythology is not a neutral poetic device, but achieves its effect by reversing the objective function which it so often performs. That "other world" of absolute truth and of fantasy is seen to be no more than a revelation of the lover's experience, and this lack of an objective standard, this subjective solipsism, contributes to the intensity of Propertius' poetry.

[26] He concludes: "La mythologie constitue ainsi un moyen privilégié de composer une réussite artistique et d'exprimer les sentiments," Boucher (n. 18), p. 267.

[27] Boucher (n. 18), p. 240.

[28] For an interesting historical explanation of this complex quality of myth in Roman poetry, see H. Dörrie, "Sinn und Funktion des Mythos in der griechischen und römischen Dichtung," *Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften* [Geisteswiss.] Vorträge G 230 (Opladen 1978).

This specific subjective use of exempla is quite different from the general function of mythology in portraying personal experience. The latter is "subjective" only in the most general sense of the term—in that the elegy as a whole, and the use of myth within the elegy, are concerned with representing the feelings and experiences of the lover.[29] The use of exempla which I will describe is a very specific—and surprising—technique. The mythological comparisons fail or fall short in their basic referential function of alluding to a separate mythological world. By referring instead to the lover's own feelings (1. 3), or by denying the reference they purport to make (2. 6), these exempla are subjective in the specific sense that their reference is to the speaker's own frame of mind, and not to a separate mythical world.[30]

Finally, it will be noted that the exempla[31] which begin 2. 6, and are discussed below, are not mythological but historical. However, (1) I will argue that the women in these exempla belong more to legend than to history, and (2) my concern here and in what follows is not with the nature of mythology *per se*, but with the ways in which the poet refers to the mythological world. Exempla which refer to fabled women of the past are therefore equally illustrative of the poet's manner and technique.

One of the ways Propertius uses mythology to portray his own feelings and experiences is by reversing the objective relation it

[29] Kölmel (n. 24), for example, is using the more general sense of the term when he concludes that Propertius "bemächtigte sich des Exempels ... um sie für seine subjektive Dichtung zum stilistischen Gesetz zu erheben" (p. 44). Likewise Fedeli is referring to the general portrayal of emotions when he observes that in Catullus, as in Propertius, "il mito non è sempre trattato in modo 'oggettivo,' alla maniera alessandrina: in lui compare già il nuovo modo di sentirlo che sarà tipico della poesia elegiaca" (Paolo Fedeli, "Properzio 1, 3. Interpretazione e proposte sull'origine dell'elegia latina," *Museum Helveticum* 31 (1974), 23–41 [=Fedeli 1974], p. 39).

[30] The *nature* of this mythical world is not important to my argument, only the fact that the reader assumes it to exist. Interpretations (a) and (b), as I have represented them, are two extremes in a spectrum of possible views.

[31] The exemplum is one of many means by which a poet makes reference to myth. Kölmel (n. 24) identifies three types of reference: paraenesis, auxesis and apodeixis (pp. 46–107); and La Penna presents a similar division into paradigm, analogy and antithesis (Antonio La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile. Un profilo di Properzio* [Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi 297, Turin 1977], p. 205). A much more detailed division into ten categories is proposed by Bollo Testa (n. 23), p. 143. The term "exemplum" is used with considerable imprecision, and Lechi (n. 22) proposes to define it more clearly by distinguishing between "exemplum" and "comparison" (pp. 84–85). According to this distinction, the opening passages of 1.3 and 2.6 should both be called comparisons rather than exempla, but I will continue to use the familiar term.

usually establishes. This subjective use of exempla is a highly sophisticated technique, and it creates an almost obsessive concern with the subjective nature of experience; in both these respects mythology in Propertius is indeed the image of its creator.

I

To illustrate Propertius' use of exempla we will turn first to elegy 1. 3,[32] which begins with the famous[33] series of mythological comparisons (1.3.1–8):

> Qualis Thesea iacuit cedente carina
> languida desertis Cnosia litoribus;
> qualis et accubuit primo Cepheia somno
> libera iam duris cotibus Andromede;
> nec minus assiduis Edonis fessa choreis
> qualis in herboso concidit Apidano:
> talis visa mihi mollem spirare quietem
> Cynthia non certis nixa caput manibus . . .

This is a highly suggestive way to begin a poem. Not only is the setting of the poem left undefined,[34] but the reference of the exempla is postponed.[35] The three mythical vignettes are introduced as similes (with repeated *qualis*), but the point of connection is not established until afterwards in line 7 (*talis*). The result is that for a brief moment

[32] The bibliography on this poem is extensive. In "L'elegia 1.3 di Properzio," *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 14 (1961), 308–26 (=Lieberg 1961), Godo Lieberg gives a useful review and analysis of important discussions up to 1957, namely Birt (1895), E. Reitzenstein (1936), Keyssner (1938), La Penna (1951), Alfonsi (1953) and Kölmel (1957). Hering (Wolfgang Hering, "Properz 1.3," *Wiener Studien* 85 [1972], 45–78) gives a briefer review of the literature of the following decade, namely Lieberg (1961), Allen (1962), Otis (1965), Klingner (1965), Curran (1966) and Wlosok (1967). More recent discussions of this poem include Lyne (1970), Fedeli (1974), Harmon (1974), Giangrande (1974), Cairns (1977), Petersmann (1978) and Baker (1980). Full references will be given when these works are cited.

[33] The elegy was made even more famous in the German world by Goethe's adaptation "Der Besuch," and the two poems are compared by E. Reitzenstein, pp. 43–44 (Erich Reitzenstein, *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz* (Philologus Supplementband 29.2, Leipzig 1936), by Fraenkel, p. 55 (Eduard Fraenkel, "Die klassische Dichtung der Römer," in *Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike*, ed. by Werner Jaeger, 2nd ed., Stuttgart 1961, pp. 47–73), and by Klingner, pp. 442–43 (Friedrich Klingner, "Properzens Elegie Qualis Thesea," in *Römische Geisteswelt*, Munich 1965, pp. 430–43).

[34] Thus E. Reitzenstein (n. 33), p. 43. Compare Klingner (n. 33), p. 437.

[35] Thus Curran, p. 190 (Leo C. Curran, "Vision and Reality in Propertius 1.3," *Yale Classical Studies* 19 (1966), 189–207).

these vignettes are suspended, free of context, until the comparison is made with the real woman Cynthia. Commentators have aptly noted the "idyllic beauty"[36] of this scene, a beauty which is shattered by the following couplet (9–10):

> ebria cum multo traherem vestigia Baccho,
> et quaterent sera nocte facem pueri.

The speaker drags his drunken footsteps into the narrative as if he were dragging muddy boots across a carpet. This rude awakening[37] anticipates a later one when the sleeping Cynthia wakes up: "The idyllic vision wakes, and not only wakes but talks, and not only talks but nags."[38] Much of the poem centers on this contrast between the subjective vision of the drunken lover and the objective reality of Cynthia.[39] It is important to note that this contrast is enacted rather than described; we view the sleeping Cynthia through the eyes of the drunken lover, and are brought back to our senses just as rudely as he.

This subjective vision is first developed in the opening exempla. We realize (although not until line 9 or 10) that this scene of idyllic beauty is not so much a description of the way Cynthia *is*, as an impression of the way she *seems* to the drunken lover.[40] The simile is

[36] Hubbard, p. 21 (Margaret Hubbard, *Propertius*, London 1974). Compare Allen (n. 12), p. 133: "this scene of calm and of mythic beauty," and Wlosok, p. 333 (Antonie Wlosok, "Die dritte Cynthia-Elegie des Properz (Prop. 1.3)," *Hermes* 95 [1967], 330–52). Fraenkel (n. 33), however, emphasizes "die Steigerung ins Grossartige" (p. 65).

[37] Thus Allen (n. 12), p. 133: "the realistic character who burst in upon the sleeping girl," and compare Lyne, p. 69 (R.O.A.M. Lyne, "Propertius and Cynthia: Elegy 1.3," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 196 [1970], 60–78 [=Lyne 1970]). Curran (n. 35), p. 198, notes the complementary shifts in tone (as the language becomes more natural) and in attitude (as the speaker reflects upon his own situation).

[38] Hubbard (n. 36), p. 21.

[39] Allen (n. 12), pp. 133–34, reverses this contrast, taking myth as objective and the narrative as subjective (as noted by Curran [n. 35], p. 189, note 1). The contrast is internalized by Lieberg 1961 (in psychological terms as an inner conflict, [n. 32], p. 324) and Harmon (as two aspects of the fantasy of the drunken lover, p. 161 in Daniel P. Harmon, "Myth and Fantasy in Propertius 1.3," *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 104 [1974], 151–65), while it is externalized by Hering (as the different points of view of man and woman [n. 32], p. 77). The contrast between subjective vision and objective reality is more clearly stated by Curran (who regards it as ironic [n. 35], p. 189), Wlosok (who regards it as tragic [n. 36], p. 352) and Hubbard (who emphasizes "the otherness of lover and beloved" [n. 36], p. 22). According to Lyne 1970 this contrast is a romantic one, and is the general purpose of the poem (n. 37), p. 61.

[40] This is well expressed by E. Reitzenstein (n. 33): "die drei Vergleiche . . . nicht objektiv vom Erzähler her, sondern aus dem Eindruck des Beschauers heraus gegeben werden, dessen Stimmung damit gezeichnet wird" (p. 44). Compare Wlosok

subjective, and its subjective nature is made explicit by the terms of the comparison (*talis visa mihi*),[41] though at first we may not take these terms literally. But the simile is subjective in a much more important manner. As Curran observes, "the identification of Cynthia with the heroines entails a complementary identification of Propertius with the appropriate gods and heroes."[42] Thus in the first exemplum he "fancies himself Bacchus discovering Ariadne on Naxos after she has been abandoned by Theseus. . . . In the context of the second exemplum, Propertius would play Perseus to Cynthia's Andromeda."[43] And in the third[44] he is Pentheus[45] spying upon a Maenad.[46] In other

(n. 36), p. 341. Many details of this subjective impression are colored by the fact that the lover is drunk (see pp. 253–58 in Robert J. Baker, "Beauty and the Beast in Propertius 1.3," *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 2, ed. by Carl Deroux (Collection Latomus 168, Brussels 1980, pp. 245–58), and Alfonsi suggests that his drunkenness gives the myths a sense of unreality (Luigi Alfonsi, "Una elegia di Properzio. Una forma di arte," *Studi Romani* 1 [1953], 245–54 [=Alfonsi 1953], p. 246). However, compare note 91 below.

[41] Compare Kölmel (n. 24), p. 130, Curran (n. 35), p. 196 and Wlosok (n. 36), p. 341.

[42] Curran (n. 35), p. 196. This identification is reinforced by the corresponding scenes in the visual arts (see below).

[43] Curran, pp. 196–97.

[44] Curran (p. 197) will not draw the logical conclusion in the case of the third exemplum: "the ferocity and violence usually associated with the Maenads are discreetly suppressed. . . . Indeed, this exemplum at first seems to set the stage for that drama, so often played out in mythology, of a girl or nymph, alone and asleep in the country, who is discovered by a vigorous god or hero." But the first exemplum manages to set just that stage without being so misleading. Curran would separate the lover's fantasy of himself as a hero from his fear of Cynthia's anger, but both are indissolubly present in the third example.

[45] I call him Pentheus for the sake of discussion. The approaching male figures in the visual arts are anonymous satyrs, divinities or men (see note 55 below). In literature the most famous individual to look upon the sleeping Bacchantes was Pentheus, although the legend of Orpheus was similar in many respects (in Ovid *Met.* 11. 69 the Maenads are given the same epithet *Edonidas*). I am sure that Propertius had in mind both the Pentheus story and the anonymous painted figures.

[46] Of these three identifications, the first is most generally acknowledged. While Lieberg 1961 (n. 32) argues that the role of the lover is implied in all three exempla (p. 316), Wlosok (n. 36) agrees that "der Dichter sieht sich selbst als erscheinenden Dionysos" (p. 342), but denies him a similar role in the second or third exemplum (pp. 335, 340). Wlosok, followed by Hering (n. 32), p. 51, goes on to conclude that the identities of the mythical figures are secondary: "Das bedeutet, dass die drei nicht als beliebige Heroinen fungieren, sondern dass die bezeichnete Situation zum Vergleich steht" (p. 334). The reason for beginning the poem with these exempla then becomes quite vague: "Dies alles ist mehr angedeutet als ausgesprochen" (p. 341). Of these three identifications, the first is also most significant later in the poem. Both Lieberg (p. 324) and Wlosok (p. 342) note the tension between the lover's identification with Dionysos in

words, we have to take the point of comparison in an even more literal manner: Cynthia was *talis visa* to the speaker as Ariadne was to Bacchus, as Andromeda was to Perseus, and as the bacchante was to Pentheus. But each woman was not "looked upon" in the same way.[47] Bacchus looked on Ariadne with desire, aroused by her beauty and vulnerability; Perseus looked on Andromeda with a mixture of desire and chivalrous solicitude; and Pentheus viewed the bacchante with conflicting emotions of prurience and fear. All these emotions are appropriate to Propertius as he comes upon the sleeping Cynthia,[48] and the mythic exempla create not so much a description of Cynthia's appearance as a specific suggestion of the lover's feelings as he sees her.

My argument so far relies upon the distinction between the idiomatic ("is") and literal ("seems") meaning of the comparison (*talis visa mihi*), and the accompanying distinction between the idyllic descriptions of the sleeping women in the beginning of the poem, and the realistic intrusion of the lover which follows. In both cases we are forced to a reassessment of what has come before. But if the male figure is not mentioned as part of the exemplum (as on this interpretation he must not be), how are we made aware of his relevance? The verbal and thematic allusions within the poem will be discussed below; perhaps even more important are the allusions which the exempla make to the visual arts. Since the seminal articles by Birt[49] and

---

the beginning of the poem, and Cynthia's identification of him with Theseus at the end. This complex thematic conflict is much simplified by Grimal (n. 15): "Le sommeil mystique qui sépare Ariane des embrassements de Thésée et lui promet ceux de Dionysos, ravit le poète et l'inquiète à la fois. Lorsque Cynthie s'éveillera, sera-t-elle toujours sienne?" (pp. 194–95).

[47] Compare the much-quoted observation of Hertzberg (n. 9): "Non κλίμακα mutatis similibus continent, sed variis visionibus dormientis Cynthiae imaginem ab omni parte illustrant. Solitudinem enim Ariadna significat,—optatam diu quietem Andromeda, profundum somnum Baccha toto corpore resoluta" (vol. 3, p. 13). As the second sentence makes clear, however, he is concerned only with external attributes. Bollo Testa (n. 23) restates this in more subjective terms: "Questi elementi tratti del mito, più di altri, riescono a visualizzare la scena offerta agli occhi di Properzio e a darci un'idea di ciò che egli percepì della *quies* di Cinzia" (p. 140). As we will see, these perceptions can be defined more precisely.

[48] Curran (n. 35) does not distinguish among them: the exempla describe a woman who "is recumbent, sleeping, abandoned, exhausted, possibly even making love, being rescued, drunk or hysterical, or in some similar state; we are given no inkling which, but are simply invited to contemplate this heroic world" (p. 190).

[49] Theodor Birt, "Die vaticanische Ariadne und die dritte Elegie des Properz," *Rheinisches Museum* 50 (1895), 31–65 and 161–90.

Keyssner,[50] the part played by works of art in the beginning of this poem has been almost universally recognized.[51] As Boucher observes, "les éléments plastiques sont des moyens d'expression et toute la pièce est nourrie de visions artistiques qui s'intègrent à une place précise dans la trame du récit."[52] Thus the first exemplum recalls scenes in which Dionysus comes upon Ariadne sleeping by the shore,[53] the second recalls scenes in which Perseus rescues Andromeda from the cliff,[54] and the third recalls scenes in which a male figure approaches a Bacchante in a meadow.[55] Each scene involves both a male and a

[50] Karl Keyssner, "Die bildende Kunst bei Properz," *Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft* 13 (1938), 169–89.

[51] An exception is Hering (n. 32), who argues that since the exempla do not reproduce these painted scenes exactly (p. 51), their concern is only with the general situation: "Gegenstand der Vergleiche der ersten sechs Verse sind *nicht* die Personen des Mythos bzw. die Situationen" (p. 60).

[52] Boucher (n. 18), p. 54.

[53] An exhaustive catalogue is given by Keyssner (n. 50), pp. 174–75. There are three types of scenes: (A) Theseus leaving the sleeping Ariadne, (B) Dionysus approaching the sleeping Ariadne, and (C) the sleeping Ariadne alone. The third group consists only of statues; thus all painted versions show her with one (sometimes both) of these lovers. As Keyssner notes, the theme of sleep was "mit Theseus wie mit Dionysos in gleicher Weise verknüpft, so dass dem Künstler reiche Abwechslungs- und Entfaltungsmöglichkeit geboten war" (p. 173).

[54] References are given by Keyssner (n. 50), p. 179; see also Wlosok (n. 36), pp. 334–35. Wall-paintings show either (A) Perseus chivalrously leading Andromeda away by the hand, or (B) the two lovers leaning together and looking at Medusa's reflection in water. The first group is more common, and includes an example in which Perseus admires the beauty of Andromeda. Since Andromeda is not shown sleeping, there is much debate about Propertius' model. Keyssner (p. 179) suggests that he has simply combined the Perseus scene with the common motif of a sleeping woman. Boucher (n. 18) argues that "Properce fait ici allusion à une peinture que nous ne connaissons plus" (p. 54), and is followed by Lieberg 1961 (n. 32), p. 316, and Whitaker (n. 21), p. 91. Curran (n. 35), on the other hand, suggests that the scene is entirely original: "By using this word [*accubuit*] here, he boldly fuses the moment of Perseus' discovery of Andromeda with the consummation of their marriage, ignoring the time Perseus had to spend in dealing with Andromeda's suitors and kinsmen" (p. 197). He is followed in this view by Harmon (n. 39), p. 154. Cairns, on the other hand, argues that the scene is makeshift: "Propertius wanted three myths to make up the standard Alexandrian pattern. So he devised a third *exemplum*, that of Andromeda, which was in strict terms inadequate in comparison with the other two but which he placed between the other two in order to disguise its inadequacy" (p. 352 in Francis Cairns, "Two unidentified Komoi of Propertius. 1.3 and 2.29," *Emerita* 45 [1977], 325–53). For my own view see note 56 below.

[55] References are given by Keyssner (n. 50), pp. 177–78, who cites also Ovid, *Am.* 1. 14. 20–22 (*purpureo iacuit semisupina toro; / tum quoque erat neclecta decens, ut Thracia Bacche, / cum temere in viridi gramine lassa iacet*) and Plutarch 249 E–F. In painting the Bacchante is usually portrayed in lush surroundings, and is always observed by another figure, whose identity, however, often cannot be determined.

female figure; and the fact that Andromeda is typically shown awake rather than sleeping should remind us that the sleeping posture is not the only thing about Cynthia that arouses the lover's interest.[56] As Whitaker points out, it is the allusion to painting which allows the poet to move from exempla of a sleeping woman to the approach of her lover: "By casting them [his mythological exempla] in a form which would immediately call to his audience's mind certain well-known paintings, he is able to move on to a new theme—his own drunken amorous approach to his mistress—simply by drawing that audience's attention to a further detail of the pictures he has evoked."[57] What I intend to show is that this introduction of a new theme is very subjective (in that it portrays the lover's emotions, and not just his "drunken amorous approach") and very specific (in that it delineates the varied aspects of these emotions).

In fact, the mythological examples which begin this poem may be described as subjective both in function and in manner. They are subjective in function (or content) in that the point of the comparison is not "is like" but "seems like." Indeed their function is radically subjective in that although the exempla purport to describe an objective fact ("She is like") they do not even describe an appearance ("She seems like"), but simply state a subjective impression ("I feel") which no longer has any formal connection with the other term of the comparison.[58]

The exempla are also subjective in manner (or form) in that they do not state a connection, but imply one. We have noted that the connection which does apply is that between the appearance of the sleeping woman, and the emotions which her appearance arouses. But we cannot know until at least line 9 or 10, when the drunken lover

[56] As Klingner (n. 33) notes, the point of resemblance between the three episodes is the male figure's "Liebesblick auf die Schöne" (p. 437). The gaze of love is an important theme, and is repeated in the exemplum of Argus and Io (Curran, n. 35, p. 201). However, the primary associations of the Perseus and Andromeda scene are chivalrous deeds rather than gazing or sleep (see also below), and this difference draws attention to the romantic associations of this episode. Although his emphasis is different, Lyne 1970 (n. 37) makes a similar argument: "the discrepancies between Cynthia's and Andromeda's situation, which have worried some commentators, are intentional and significant on a subtle level" (p. 68).

[57] Whitaker (n. 21), p. 92. Compare the observations of Lyne 1970 (n. 37) that while in the exempla themselves "Propertius is concerned with the sleeping heroines as single figures" (p. 67), the "ominous omissions" of the male figures acquire importance later in the poem (pp. 67–68).

[58] We could say that the subjective impression (desire) is caused by the objective appearance (beauty), but this would be an assertion of causality, not of similarity (*qualis . . . talis*).

stumbles on the scene, that this is the way in which we should understand the examples.[59] There is a strong hint in the portrait of the bacchante,[60] but even here we must wait until the third example. Thus the relevance of the mythic exempla is not given but must be reconstructed subjectively by the reader.

We have so far considered this passage as a unit, and have treated all three exempla as contributing to a single effect. But while their general function is the same, each vignette is different and each corresponds to a different complex of emotions. As a result the opening passage is more profoundly subjective in that it corresponds not to a single vision or fancy of the drunken lover, but to a dynamic series of emotions which he experiences upon seeing his mistress.[61] Rather than an objective description of the lover's (subjective) state of mind, the series of varied emotions provides us with a subjective impression of his response to seeing her. In a paradoxical way this movement is also objective, in that it precisely anticipates the movement of the poem as a whole. The remainder of the poem falls into three sections:[62] 11–20 where the lover approaches Cynthia impelled

[59] The proper term for this is *e sequentibus praecedentia*. Williams, p. 73 (Gordon Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*, New Haven 1980), uses the term in connection with this passage, but only to describe thematic anticipation, such as the anticipation of Cynthia's anger by the figure of the bacchante.

[60] The interest of the bacchante, ever since Euripides' *Bacchae* (especially the first messenger's speech, 677–774), lay not so much in her appearance as in the chance that she might awake and attack her viewer. Propertius makes full use of this in the final section of the poem. Compare Luck (n. 15): "the Maenad suggests the outbreak . . . of which she is capable" (p. 122), and Lyne 1980 (n. 14), pp. 99–100.

[61] Harmon (n. 39) describes as "unfortunate" the observation by Hertzberg that the three exempla do not form a climax (see note 47), and cites the continued acceptance of this view (p. 155 with note 18). He goes on to argue that the exempla form a priamel, with the "Maenad as the climactic member of the list" (p. 157), since her drunk and ecstatic condition is closest to that of the speaker himself. However, I find nothing which identifies the Maenad as his "*altera*" (p. 165), especially given the sense of distance between the lovers (Wlosok, n. 36, p. 352). See below.

[62] This division is quite close to those of Lyne 1970, n. 37 (1–10, 11–20, 21–30, 31–33, 34–46) and Curran, n. 35, p. 190 (1–10, 11–20, 21–34, 35–46), and also similar to that of E. Reitzenstein, n. 33, p. 46 (1–10, 11–20, 21–30, 31–34, 35–40, 41–46), which is followed by Lieberg 1961 (n. 32), p. 313. The unusual division of Wlosok, n. 36, p. 351 (1–12, 13–20, 21–26, 27–34, 35–46), which is followed by Hering (n. 32), p. 73, is criticized by Fedeli 1974 (n. 29), pp. 23–24. Compare pp. 112–13 in Paolo Fedeli, *Sesto Properzio. Il primo libro delle elegie*, Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere "La Columbaria," Studi 53 (Florence 1980) (=Fedeli 1980). Fedeli argues against this strict symmetrical structure on the grounds that it contradicts the neoteric canon of ποικιλία. Petersmann, pp. 954–55 (Gerhard Petersmann, "Properz 1.3," *Latomus* 37 [1978], 953–59), criticizes the undue emphasis Wlosok places on the ring structure of the poem, and proposes a two-part structure (1–30, 35–46) wherein the speaker and Cynthia both

by desire, 21–33 where he gives her gifts and shows his concern, and 34–46 where she wakes up and sharply rebukes him. This movement of the poem from desire to solicitude to fear of assault is exactly paralleled by the opening exempla.[63]

Bacchus and Ariadne / lines 11–20. The principal emotion associated with the mythological scene is desire,[64]—perhaps (given the god's nature) a drunken desire, but certainly desire mixed with admiration for her beauty. In the following scene the speaker is likewise impelled by desire, and in lines 15–16 has every intent of obeying his impulse. The similarities are in fact more specific. In the first case the god of wine and love comes upon a sleeping woman; in the second the drunken lover, compelled by Love and Wine (*hac Amor hac Liber*, 14), comes upon his sleeping mistress. In both cases we may also assume that the desire was heightened by the vulnerability of the sleeping woman. Furthermore, just as Dionysus usually approaches Ariadne with a thronging *thiasos*,[65] the lover approaches his mistress accompanied by *pueri* (10) shaking torches like a *thiasos*[66] or a crowd of Cupids.[67] Finally, as Boucher observes,[68] the substitution of *Bacchus* for *vinum* in line 9 (*ebria cum multo traherem vestigia Baccho*) emphasizes that the drunken lover is here playing the role of Dionysus discovering Ariadne. However in the myth the god will have his way, while the lover stops short, fearing his mistress' anger, and is frozen, all eyes, like Argus watching Io.[69]

Perseus and Andromeda / lines 21–33. The principal emotion associated with this mythical scene is Perseus' chivalrous concern for

---

move from distance to closeness (see esp. his diagram on p. 959). His analysis in many respects resembles that of Reitzenstein.

[63] Coincidental support for this interpretation is given by Lyne's division of the poem. His divisions closely correspond to my own (see previous note), and his descriptions of them suggest a similar progression of emotions: "A Real Temptation," "'Tendresse' and Pathos," "[The Real Cynthia]" (pp. 70, 72, 75).

[64] Compare Catullus 64. 251–53 (*volitabat Iacchus . . . te quaerens, Ariadna, tuoque incensus amore*) and Ellis' note on the frequent portrayal of Dionysus, Eros and Ariadne in vase painting (p. 280, Robinson Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus*, Oxford 1889). Wlosok (n. 36) notes: "Wie Dionysos ist Properz vom Anblick der schönen Schläferin hingerissen und in Liebesleidenschaft zu ihr entflammt" (p. 342).

[65] For examples in art, see Wlosok (n. 36), p. 337, note 4, and in literature compare Catullus 64. 252 f.: *Iacchus / cum thiaso Satyrorum et Nysigenis Silenis*.

[66] Thus Lieberg 1961 (n. 32), p. 321.

[67] Thus Lyne 1970 (n. 37), p. 63.

[68] Boucher (n. 18), p. 243.

[69] The comparison comes unexpectedly (Lyne 1970, n. 37, pp. 70–71), and Argus' amazement at the strange appearance of Io (*ignotis cornibus*) anticipates the lover's amazement at Cynthia's *saevitia* (Hering, n. 32, p. 64).

Andromeda, or rather a mixture of concern and love.[70] The emotions of the speaker in the second section are the same: he straightens her hair, gives her gifts, and fears for her well-being even in her dreams. In particular, the mythological scene in art is typified by romantic gestures, such as Perseus leading Andromeda by the hand, or the two lovers leaning together (see note 54 above), while the scene with Cynthia is filled with romantic gestures and tokens, such as placing the wreath on her forehead and offering her apples.[71] Finally, Propertius' treatment of the Andromeda myth is unusual in portraying the woman asleep,[72] and this difference is emphasized by *primo . . . somno* (3), the only mention of sleep in the series of exempla. In a similar manner the peculiar atmosphere of "hopeless tenderness"[73] in the scene with Cynthia depends on the theme of sleep, both in the rejection of the lover's gifts (*ingrato . . . somno*, 25) and in his concern at her uneasy sleeping (27–30). Once again a chief difference is that Perseus is successful, while the gifts and concern of the lover are ineffectual. As he lingers over her, he is interrupted and upstaged by the concern of the lingering moon (*luna moraturis sedula luminibus*, 32).[74]

Pentheus and Maenad / lines 34–46. The emotions of Pentheus when viewing the Maenads were a combination of prurient desire and fear at their savagery.[75] The same combination of emotions is felt—

[70] See especially Maiuri, p. 81 ("Like a knight-errant of the age of chivalry, Perseus saved the fair Andromeda from the jaws of a sea-monster, and a large picture dealing with this incident was found in the House of the Dioscuri"), and the plate on p. 79 (Amedeo Maiuri, *Roman Painting*, trans. by Stuart Gilbert, Geneva 1953). Keyssner (n. 50) comments on the idyllic atmosphere: "Von einen Nachzittern schweren Erlebens ist in diesen Bild nichts zu spüren" (p. 179).

[71] As Lyne 1970 (n. 37) notes, "in lines 21f. and 24ff., Propertius is not just giving presents to Cynthia, which he has brought back from the party, but is performing two conventional gestures of love" (p. 72). On the placing of a wreath, compare Giangrande, pp. 31–32 (G. Giangrande, "Los tópicos helenísticos en la elegía latina," *Emerita* 42 [1974], 1–36), and on the apples compare Enk's note on line 24. Curran (n. 35) notes that "in describing the draping of the garlands and bestowal of other gifts upon an unresponsive recipient, Propertius introduces a subtle variation on the theme of the *exclusus amator*" (p. 203). For an interesting interpretation of the entire elegy as a variation on this theme, see Cairns (n. 54).

[72] See note 54 above.

[73] Lyne 1970 (n. 37), p. 72.

[74] Baker (n. 40) remarks upon "the attribution to a more or less personified moonlight of an attitude properly belonging to Propertius himself" (p. 246).

[75] As of course in *Bacchae* (note 60 above). Compare Wlosok (n. 36): "Damit ist darauf hingedeutet, dass ihre Erregung durch den Schlaf nur überdeckt ist und beim

throughout the poem—by the lover viewing Cynthia: he desires her intensely, yet fears her anger when awoken. This conflict is most clearly expressed in lines 17–18 in words that are equally suited to the mythological situation:

> non tamen ausus eram dominae turbare quietem,
> expertae metuens iurgia saevitiae.

In this case, however, the whole poem corresponds in emotion to the scene of the Maenad, while the final passage depicts that savage outburst which the lover had been fearing.[76] The fury of the woman when awakened corresponds to the *fear* of that fury in the mythological exemplum. Once more there is also a certain lack of correspondence. While in the mythological version the awakened Maenads destroy Pentheus, Cynthia's violent outburst quickly subsides[77] and the fierce Maenad becomes instead a Penelope waiting for Odysseus[78] or an Ariadne abandoned by Theseus.[79]

The opening series of exempla is therefore dynamic in that it portrays a sequence of emotions from desire to solicitude to fear of assault, and it is profoundly subjective in that this anticipates the sequence of emotions experienced by the lover as he views his sleeping mistress. The series of exempla does not form a climax, just as the emotions associated with them are of equal importance. Nevertheless, there is a crescendo of tone, building towards the Maenad in one case, and Cynthia's outburst in the other. Sechi observes "un crescendo di movimento nel succedersi di questi tre quadri, che si articolano su tre verbi: *iacuit, accubuit, concidit*."[80] But there is more to this progression. Just as the sleep of Ariadne is

---

Erwachen wieder losbrechen kann. Das ist der entscheidende Aspekt dieses mythologischen Beispiels" (p. 340).

[76] A comparison of the woken Cynthia with the Maenad is made also by Curran (n. 35), p. 200, Wlosok (n. 36), p. 348 and Williams (n. 59), p. 72. Klingner (n. 33), p. 439, points out that Cynthia is quite unlike a Maenad at the end of her speech, but it is her initial outburst (*tandem . . . improbe . . .*) which reveals the woman he had feared.

[77] For the change in mood see E. Reitzenstein (n. 33), pp. 45–46 and Wlosok (n. 36), pp. 347–50. Giangrande (n. 71) ascribes this change to Propertius' "Weiberpsychologie" (pp. 34–35). Lyne 1970 (n. 37), however, regards the speech as a sustained attack, with simply "a change of tactics" at the end (p. 76). Klingner (n. 33), on the other hand, regards the whole as a "sanfte Klage" (p. 439).

[78] Thus E. Reitzenstein (n. 33), p. 44, and Wlosok (n. 36), p. 350.

[79] Thus Lieberg 1961 (n. 32), pp. 322–24, Curran (n. 35), pp. 205–06 and Wlosok (n. 36), p. 349. Compare note 46 above.

[80] Margherita Sechi, "Nota a Properzio 1.3," *Maia* 6 (1953), 208–13, p. 209.

contrasted with her earlier lament (*Thesea . . . carina, desertis litoribus*),[81] that of Andromeda is contrasted with her earlier hardships (*libera iam duris cotibus*),[82] and the sleep of the Bacchante is contrasted with her previous ecstasy (*assiduis . . . fessa choreis*) which at any moment may break forth again.[83] This contrast, which is strongest in the third exemplum, is applied also to Cynthia in the following couplet, as she lies posed between sleeping and waking (*non certis . . . manibus*).[84] The sections which follow likewise build towards the awakening of Cynthia, first in the lover's fear of waking her (17–18),[85] and then in his concern at her uneasy sleep (27–30).[86] Her awakening in the final section of the poem both confirms this sequence and reinforces the similarity between Cynthia and the Maenad.

We began by observing that much of this elegy centers on the contrast between the subjective vision of the lover and the objective reality of Cynthia, a contrast which is expressed in part by the difference between the heroines in the exempla and the real Cynthia of the narrative. At the end of the poem, however, these distinctions become blurred. Cynthia seems to enter the mythical world: she resembles a Penelope or Ariadne,[87] she sings to the lyre of Orpheus (*Orpheae . . . lyrae*, 42), and is described in language which strongly resembles the opening exempla (*fessa*, 42, *deserta*, 43).[88] In the case of the lover, there is a similar contrast between the heroic role implied in the exempla and the role he actually plays in the following sections of the poem. In the first two, the drunken lover fails where Dionysus and Perseus had succeeded; but in the third, the lover is spared where Pentheus and Orpheus were destroyed. This surprising reversal,[89] by which the real situation of the lover is superior to that of the mythical figure implied in the exemplum, also blurs the contrast between the

[81] See Wlosok (n. 36), pp. 338–39, who points out the echoes of Ariadne's lament in Catullus 64. On the relation between the two poems, see also Klingner (n. 33), p. 435, Curran (n. 35), pp. 196–97 and Ross, pp. 54–57 (David O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge 1975).

[82] Compare Wlosok (n. 36), p. 335.

[83] See notes 60 and 75 above.

[84] Compare Lyne 1970 (n. 37), pp. 68–69, and Williams (n. 59), p. 72. Curran (n. 35), on the other hand, suggests a contrast between this "imminent threat of movement" and "the heroines frozen like works of art" (p. 195).

[85] Thus E. Reitzenstein (n. 33), p. 46.

[86] Thus Wlosok (n. 36), p. 347.

[87] See notes 78 and 79 above.

[88] Thus Curran (n. 35), pp. 205–06. Compare Allen (n. 12), p. 133.

[89] Such reversals are among the many hellenistic topoi in the poem noted by Giangrande (n. 71). For a broader study of Propertius' models see Fedeli 1974 (n. 29).

two realms, and suggests that vision and reality may have more in common than we expected.[90]

The exempla which begin 1. 3 do not describe an objective situation so much as present the viewer's subjective impressions; they do this in such a way as to anticipate the development of the poem as a whole; and they finally reveal a surprising coincidence between their subjective and objective functions.[91]

II

Elegy 2. 6[92] begins with a series of exempla similar to that which begins 1. 3:

> Non ita complebant Ephyraeae Laidos aedis,
> ad cuius iacuit Graecia tota fores;
> turba Menandreae fuerat nec Thaidos olim
> tanta, in qua populus lusit Erichthonius;
> nec quae deletas potuit componere Thebas,
> Phryne tam multis facta beata uiris.
> quin etiam falsos fingis tibi saepe propinquos,
> oscula nec desunt qui tibi iure ferant. (2. 6. 1–8)

[90] Compare the observation of Bollo Testa (n. 23) that in this poem myth "assume una doppia funzione: spiega e condiziona insieme la realtà, le dà sue sembianze" (p. 140 note 7).

[91] Thus the exempla combine—and blur—"subjective" and "objective" functions. For Kölmel (n. 24), however, the subjectivity of the exempla is absolute: "Nur undeutlich wird die schlafende Gestalt erhellt, . . . da, es ist Ariadne, das wohlbekannte, geliebte Bild! Der Trunkene erschrickt, schliesst die Augen, öffnet sie wieder: es ist Andromeda, nein, eine Bacchantin!" (p. 131). Kölmel is taking to an extreme the observation of Alfonsi 1953 (n. 40) that the unreality of the heroines owes something to the drunkenness of the lover (p. 246). Harmon (n. 39) goes further, and argues that the whole poem is a "drunken reverie" (p. 152). However, the only indication that the narrative is imagined is the absence of a phrase such as "to the couch" in line 9 (p. 152), while there is every indication that it describes an objective situation (compare note 37 above).

[92] The bibliography for this poem is much smaller than for 1. 3. Apart from the commentators, the fullest discussions are in R. Reitzenstein, pp. 215–220 (R. Reitzenstein, "Properz-Studien," *Hermes* 31 [1896], 185–220), Boyancé 1942, pp. 57–62 (Pierre Boyancé, "Surcharges de rédaction chez Properce," *Revue des Études Latines* 20 [1942], 54–69) and Williams (n. 59), pp. 82–85. See also Copley, who discusses the symbolic use in this poem of the lover's door (pp. 75–76 in Frank O. Copley, *Exclusus Amator. A Study in Latin Love Poetry*, Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Assoc. 17, [Madison] 1956). I will refer to editions and commentators simply by name; for fuller references see Fedeli 1980 (n. 62), pp. 19–26 and Hanslik, p. xxiii (Rudolf Hanslik, *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, Leipzig 1979). Citation of commentators is *ad loc.*, unless otherwise indicated.

While the examples here are taken not from mythology but from history,[93] it is no exaggeration to describe all three as legendary. Lais was immortalized in the painting of Apelles, Thais in the plays of Menander, and Phryne in the inscription of Alexander.[94] The use of the Greek forms of their names (*Laidos*, *Thaidos*, *Phryne*) and of allusive geographical epithets (*Ephyraeae*, *Erichthonius*) reinforces the impression that the poet is alluding not to a factual past but to a quasi-mythological realm.[95] The resemblance to the beginning of 1. 3[96] goes further than this: both poems begin with a series of three exempla,[97] each of which describes a legendary woman, and in both poems this opening passage, despite its function of providing a comparison with Cynthia, is somewhat detached from its context.

Let us look at this second feature more closely. In 2. 6 the connection of the examples with their context is severed completely: they form a single sentence, and at line 7 a new sentence begins with nothing to complete the terms of comparison (*non ita . . .*) introduced in the exempla.[98] But if the examples are left dangling with respect to their context, there is also a lack of connection within them. The first (*non ita complebant*) lacks a definite subject,[99] and if we supply one from the following line (*Graecia tota*) it does not agree in number. The second comparison is expressed in different terms (*turba . . . fuerat nec . . . tanta*), and is fragmented, postponing the term of comparison

[93] A difference Rothstein considers exceptional, p. 179.

[94] In the cases of Thais (*Menandreae*, 3) and Phryne (*deletas potuit componere Thebas*, 5) the poet makes clear reference to this immortalization. Apelles is not mentioned, but Lais was best known by this portrait; see Enk, pp. 95–99.

[95] The comparisons should therefore be regarded as mythical exempla rather than historical παραδείγματα. The latter were heavily favored by Latin prose writers; see Alewell (Karl Alewell, *Über das rhetorische* παράδειγμα. *Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendung in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserheit*, Leipzig 1913). On the distinction between mythical and historical comparisons see also Lechi (n. 22), pp. 86–87, whose definition of the latter ("avere lo status della *res vera*") would not apply to the legendary women of this poem. This is not to deny the considerable difference in tone between these exempla and those of 1. 3, as is noted by Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17), p. 39.

[96] Noted briefly by Williams (n. 59), p. 82. La Penna (n. 31) compares the beginning of 2. 14, which is similar to 2. 6 rhetorically, but is more "monumental" (p. 230).

[97] Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17) observes that the use of myth, and especially of such series of two, three or four exempla, is more common in Book 2 (p. 45).

[98] Verstraete (n. 20), pp. 264–65 (without making mention of this poem), notes that in Book 2 mythic exempla are more often introduced without explicit forms of comparison. Giardina proposes a lacuna after line 6 on the grounds that the comparison is not completed.

[99] Compare Camps: "the subject is an unspecified "they," identified by the context as Lais' admirers."

(*tanta*) until the second line. In the third example the comparison is expressed in different terms again (*tam multis facta beata viris*), and the change of subject from the lovers to the woman (*nec quae . . .*) further weakens the connection with the preceding example. The effect of hesitancy and confusion is further heightened when the sentence breaks off, and the speaker begins anew with *quin etiam*.

This disconnectedness is not just syntactic. The couplet following the exempla, however paranoid in emphasis (*falsos fingis . . . propinquos*), allows us to infer the point of the comparison: the number of Cynthia's lovers can be compared to that of the great legendary courtesans. The six lines which follow (9–14) elaborate on this paranoid fear, but do so in a manner which contradicts the preceding exempla: if he is jealous of everything (*omnia me laedent*) and asks her forgiveness (*ignosce timori*), then the suspicion implied by these exempla must simply be another of his delusions.[100] The elegy's opening statement ("Cynthia is worse than the greatest of prostitutes") has been repudiated by the speaker himself; and it is because this statement is couched in figurative language (the exemplum), and because of its hesitancy and disconnectedness that this repudiation is possible. The exemplum is therefore subjective in that the statement which it conveys may not be true, but simply a delusion of the speaker. It does not describe the way things are, but the conflicting emotions with which he views them.

By contrast with the exempla in 1. 3, those in 2. 6 are ostensibly objective, and are only seen to be subjective in what follows. The comparison is objective in function (or content) since it asserts the fact of Cynthia's immorality ("Cynthia is more unfaithful than A, B and C"). It remains objective in the following passage; the lover's renunciation is not "Cynthia *appears* more unfaithful than A, B and C" but "It is *not true* that Cynthia is more unfaithful. . . ." It is not the comparison itself which is subjective, but the understanding of it: is it true or a delusion? which should we believe? The renunciation of the original comparison renders its function fundamentally subjective since we are uncertain whether there is any truth to it at all.

The comparison is also objective in manner (or form) since, although the syntax stops short of directly identifying Cynthia with the legendary courtesans, both terms of the comparison are given.

[100] Williams (n. 59) likewise observes: "The apology (9–14) shifts blame away from Cynthia and consequently the women in the comparisons" (p. 83). But the implication of this is not (or not yet) that "man's sexual lust is at fault" (p. 83); *me tener in cunis et sine voce puer* is the voice not of moral rectitude but of self-delusion.

However, after the comparison has been renounced by the speaker, and his contradictory statements have been left unreconciled, the reader must infer the emotional confusion which this represents. The conflict of utterances is an objective correlative to his conflict of emotions, and the latter must be completely supplied by the reader. There is no clear indication why we should understand this confusion in one way rather than another, rendering the manner of comparison also fundamentally subjective.

Elegy 2. 6 falls into four parts: three main sections (1–14, 15–24, 25–36) and a conclusion (37–42).[101] Each part follows the pattern of veiled assertion followed by repudiation, replicating the structure of the opening passage. In the second section the veiled assertion is contained in the first couplet (15–16):

> his olim, ut fama est, uitiis ad proelia uentum est,
> his Troiana uides funera principiis;

It is assumed that we know the nature of the speaker's complaint (*his . . . uitiis, his . . . principiis*), but these terms are unclear, and our uncertainty is only increased by the impersonal construction (*ad proelia uentum est*; compare the vague construction in line 1, noted above). Since wanton promiscuity is more of a "vice" than fearful jealousy, and since Helen, not Paris, was traditionally blamed for causing the Trojan War, we must infer that the couplet compares the promiscuity of Cynthia (*his . . . uitiis*) with that of Helen (*his . . . principiis*). But the following lines, although apparently continuing this theme (*eadem dementia*), directly contradict it.[102] The veiled

[101] Hertzberg (n. 9) gives a slightly different scheme: 1–22, 23–24, 25–36, and 37–42, with the first section falling into three parts: 1–8, 9–14 and 15–22 (vol. 3, pp. 103–04).

[102] The contradiction can be removed if we follow Schöne (n. 3), who explains: "Vocibus igitur 'his vitiis' v.15 (quibus respondent verba 'eadem dementia' v.17) non amicae levitatem, sed virorum immodestiam poeta significat, quam ut explanet fabulas offert Paridis Helenam abducentis, Centaurorum Hippodamiam appetentium, Romanorum Sabinas rapientium. Iam vero hoc perspecto intelleges neque primo exemplo respici propria Cynthiae vitia neque ceteris omnino demonstrari morum perversitatem (sic Rothst. ad v.15 et 17), sed omnes fabulas pariter esse idoneas ad nimiam virorum licentiam confirmandam" (pp. 17–18). However, this interpretation (followed by Enk, Camps and Verstraete [n. 20], p. 264) does not explain how lines 15–16 could possibly suggest male lust when the myth itself, and the poem so far, both deal with female infidelity. The contradiction must therefore remain, although it may be accounted for in slightly different ways. Rothstein regards the movement from female infidelity to male lust as a broadening of the theme: "während man bei *his vitiis* noch an den Leichtsinn der Helena denken kann, der zu Cynthias jetzigem Verhalten die mythische Parallele bildet, hat sich hier die Vorstellung erweitert zu der allgemeinen Missachtung

condemnation of female immorality[103] is superseded by an explicit condemnation of male immorality in the rapes of the Lapiths and the Sabines (17–21). The repudiation is direct (*tu criminis auctor*) but outlandish (*per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor*), as was the repudiation in the preceding section. The final couplet of this section[104] anticipates the poem's conclusion by paradoxically[105] combining these themes (23–24):

> felix Admeti coniunx et lectus Vlixis,
> et quaecumque uiri femina limen amat!

One could argue either that Admetus and Ulysses were blessed in having faithful wives or that Alcestis and Penelope were blessed in having faithful husbands, but the couplet manages to combine both.[106] Both of the myths in the first line, as well as the moral in the second line, could only support the first of these meanings, and the implication that the woman should be faithful. The couplet is made to bear the second meaning only because of the contradictory change of

---

der bestehenden Verbindungen, auch auf seiten der Männer, und diese erweiterte Vorstellung leitet allmählich zu den politischen Betrachtungen über" (p. 181). The change from Helen to Paris as the culpable party, however, is a reversal rather than an expansion, and the exaggeration in 19–22 (see below) underlines this reversal. The technique is better explained by Boyancé 1942 (n. 92): "dans une première redaction, qui correspondait à une première humeur du poète, ces baisers suspects étaient des baisers coupables: *his vitiis*, de telles fautes ont provoqué les grandes malheurs de la légende. Mais, à une seconde lecture, le poète a surtout songé au manque de certitude qui était le sien. Il n'y a là peut-être, s'est-il dit, qu'une apparence, que l'ombre d'une conduite fautive" (p. 58). "Il s'ensuit peut-être, dans l'expression, une légère incohérence au vers 16 avec le *his vitiis* qui nous oblige à nous ressouvenir du vers 6; mais la faute est bien rachetée par ce que le poème gagne de saveur, à mêler aux plaintes et aux accusations les retours sur lui-même" (p. 59). An explanation of this phenomenon as a rhetorical technique is given by Williams (n. 59), pp. 82–83. He calls this figure "arbitrary assertion of similarity," and gives his analysis a sound theoretical basis (see esp. Chapter 2), but does not explain the significance of this device in this poem.

[103] Butler and Barber thus explain *his vitiis* as "Unchastity, not jealousy," but with no discussion.

[104] Enk transposes these lines so that 23–24 follow after 25–26, but has not been followed by other editors. Butler and Barber agree that they "break the argument," while Bailey argues that "some of the transitions [in 23–42] are undeniably abrupt, but none taken singly is beyond defence" (D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, Cambridge 1956, p. 72).

[105] R. Reitzenstein (n. 92) describes it somewhat differently: "Der Ausruf erleichtert dies Durchbrechen eines streng logischen Gedankenbaus" (p. 218), the purpose being to avoid offending his mistress (compare note 116 below).

[106] A further contradiction between this view of the past as a better age, and the opposite view expressed in 15 ff., is noted by Schöne (n. 3), p. 65, and Rothstein (n. 16), p. 181.

subject (*felix . . . quaecumque*); in the first line this change of subject involves a clever, almost outlandish, use of metonymy (*Admeti coniunx et lectus Vlixis*).[107]

The third section begins and ends with a veiled reference to the immorality of women (25–26; 35–36):[108]

> templa Pudicitiae quid opus statuisse puellis,
> si cuiuis nuptae quidlibet esse licet?
> . . .
> sed non immerito uelauit aranea fanum
> et mala desertos occupat herba deos.

In this section, as in the first, the condemnation of Cynthia and of female infidelity is "veiled" only insofar as it is couched in figural language, namely the rhetorical question and the metonymy of temples for morals. As before, this condemnation is repudiated and the responsibility placed instead[109] on men and male immorality, in particular the painters of *obscenas tabellas* in houses. This shift is once more facilitated by the impersonal construction of the initial assertion (*quid opus, quidlibet esse licet*), and again the reversal is outlandish.[110] Not only are neglect of the gods and the decline of morality due to the

[107] Rothstein acknowledges "die Härte des Ausdrucks," which he regards, however, as the result of a double metonymy by which Alcestis and Penelope are substituted for the morality of a bygone age: "Glücklich sind nicht die Personen, die genannt werden, sondern die ehelichen Verhältnisse, in denen sie leben."

[108] As will be clear from my discussion, I see no reason to alter the text by punctuating after *immerito*. Rothstein, Barber, Enk and Hanslik add an exclamation mark, while Camps prints the line without punctuation: "The point will then be that the gods' temples are neglected with good reason because the gods have shown themselves indifferent to the conduct of men by not punishing and checking evil practices such as those indicated in 31–34." But surely the blame is laid on women, not on the gods: spider-webs and weeds have overrun the temples because piety and chastity have disappeared. Williams (n. 59) also retains the line without punctuation, but without discussion (p. 83). For a further defense of the received text see Boyancé 1942 (n. 92), pp. 59–62, and compare the similar remarks of Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17), p. 30.

[109] Compare Rothstein's observation that the poet uses this moral discussion to veil his condemnation of Cynthia (note 111 below), and his similar observation that "der Dichter auch schon vorher (v.19) das Bestreben gezeigt hat, nach dem Urheber aller dieser Verirrungen zu suchen und ihn für sein persönliches Schicksal verantwörtlich zu machen" (p. 183).

[110] Boucher (n. 18) observes that "Properce est le seul élégiaque qui ait appliqué à la peinture le thème de l'εὑρετής, qui ait formulé des malédictions contre son inventeur" (p. 46), and this original use of the motif, together with "the abruptness with which the subject of erotic pictures is brought in" (Camps, p. 95), gives further emphasis to this reversal. The completeness of the reversal suggests that the poet is not simply embarking on a digression, as is suggested by Boyancé 1942 (n. 92), p. 62.

painting of dirty pictures, but the Golden Age is redefined as the time before they were invented (*tum paries nullo crimine pictus erat*).[111] This section, like the preceding one, ends with a couplet which combines both implications of the passage. The obvious meaning of 35–36 is that spider-webs and weeds have overrun the temples deservedly—because female fidelity and morality are no longer upheld. But the ambiguity of expression (*sed non immerito*: what precisely is the crime, and who precisely is to blame?), and the absence of a clear connection with the preceding attack on the painters of obscene pictures,[112] mean that the attribution of blame is left open; the fault may be Cynthia's—or her lover's—or perhaps even the gods'.[113] It should be noted that in the first and third sections the condemnation is veiled and couched in figurative language, while its repudiation is not. By contrast, the entire second section is couched in figural language and the condemnation there is "veiled" in that it is deliberately ambiguous. We should note further that: (1) the specific condemnation of Cynthia is now more veiled (in the first section the disconnected exemplum helps obscure the reference to her [*etiam . . . tibi*, 7]; in the second and third sections there is no reference to her at all); and (2) the tone of the condemnation is now less veiled (while the first section is largely personal, and the second entirely mythological, the third is overtly moral).

The conclusion of the poem is in two parts (37–42):[114]

[111] Rothstein observes that "Unzweifelhaft sind diese moralischen Betrachtungen durch die gleichzeitigen Reformversuche des Augustus angeregt" (p. 179). R. Reitzenstein (n. 92) perhaps takes this too far: "So wenig es mir einfallen kann, das Lied des Properz als reines Tendenzgedicht mit politischen Zweck zu betrachten, so möchte ich doch die Übereinstimmung mit dem officiösen Dichter [Horace] ebensowenig für zufällig erklären" (p. 220). As Rothstein continues: "aber der Dichter spricht doch auch hier nicht als Moralist, sondern als ein Liebender . . . der den Tadel, den er gegen seine Geliebte nicht offen auszusprechen wagt, in die Form einer allgemeinen Erörterung über einen damals viel besprochenen Gegenstand kleidet" (p. 179). Compare Boyancé 1942 (n. 92), p. 61.

[112] Compare Boyancé 1942 (n. 92): "Le vers 35 se raccorde mal, lui aussi, avec ce qui le précède immédiatement" (p. 59), who cites the problems it has caused commentators (p. 59, note 1, to which should be added R. Reitzenstein's suggestion of a lacuna [n. 92], pp. 219–20).

[113] Thus Camps (see note 108 above), who is presumably following Boyancé 1942 (n. 92): "puisqu'ils [les Dieux] n'ont pas su mieux défendre la vertu des femmes romaines, ils ont mérité leur abandon, en fait l'abandon du sanctuaire de Pudicitia" (pp. 61–62). This third possibility, however, is not clearly expressed, and cannot be insisted upon.

[114] The phrase *me ducet* has been suspected, primarily because "the change from *nos* to *me* is needlessly awkward" (Butler and Barber, p. 201). But it is not unlikely that the

quos igitur tibi custodes, quae limina ponam,
quae numquam supra pes inimicus eat?
nam nihil inuitae tristis custodia prodest:
quam peccare pudet, Cynthia, tuta sat est.

nos uxor numquam, numquam me ducet amica:
semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.

It begins with figural language, a rhetorical question whose implication is that the faithfulness of women cannot be enforced. This veiled assertion is spelled out in the following line, and its restatement in the pentameter incorporates the theme of male immorality: she who is faithful is safe enough (i.e. from unwanted male lovers). The contradictory theme is worked into the assertion without repudiating it, and this first overt expression of criticism is made clearer and more forceful by naming Cynthia for the first time. This conclusion leads us to expect that he will place some demand upon Cynthia's faithfulness, but once more we are surprised by a reversal: in the final couplet the speaker substitutes an exaggerated declaration of his own fidelity.[115]

Each section of the poem begins with a veiled criticism of Cynthia, an implied condemnation of her unfaithfulness which takes on progressively stronger moral overtones. But each section then continues with an outlandish or exaggerated repudiation of this suggestion,[116] whether his paranoid suspicions of the little baby (*me tener in cunis et sine uoce puer*, 10), his blaming Romulus for modern decadence

---

awkwardness is deliberate. If *me* intrudes, it does so in order to emphasize once more the unnatural way in which the speaker places the burden of fidelity on himself. Hertzberg and Paganelli retain *me ducet*, while most editors read *seducet*. Enk and Richardson transfer the final couplet to the following poem.

[115] Rothstein regards the substitution as calculated to secure Cynthia's reform: "Dem leichtfertigen oder mindestens verdächtigen Treiben Cynthias stellt der Dichter als versöhnenden Abschluss, der der Bitte, die dieses ganze Gedicht enthält, grösseren Nachdruck geben soll, die Versicherung seiner eigenen unwandelbaren Treuen gegenüber" (p. 185). Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17) gives a more psychological explanation: "di questa fluttuazione ed incertezza è documento il continuo ondeggiare dell'elegia che si chiude così repentinamente nella attestazione d'affetto che è l'unica certa e da cui ha avuto spunto ed origine il contrasto profundo dei sentimenti" (p. 41).

[116] Compare Rothstein, who regards the veiled condemnations as skirted or avoided rather than repudiated: "So sehr das Gefühl der Eifersucht das ganze Gedicht beherrscht, so bemüht sich der Dichter doch, alle verletzenden Vorwürfe und schroffen Forderungen zu vermeiden" (p. 178). Very similar is R. Reitzenstein (n. 92): "Solcher Argwohn muss die Geliebte kränken, und doch kann der Dichter ihn nicht unterdrücken. So sucht er ihn denn in der feinsten Weise zu motivieren, *ohne doch Cynthia dabei zu verletzen. Hierdurch bestimmt sich der ganze Gang des folgenden Gedichtes*" (p. 217).

(*per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor*, 22) or his polemic against the "inventor" of pornography (*quae manus obscenas depinxit prima tabellas*, 27). In each case the attempt to shift blame from Cynthia to himself and other men has a ludicrous effect,[117] and in the conclusion the burden of remaining faithful is shifted from Cynthia to himself in a similarly exaggerated manner (*semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris*, 42).[118] We are not given a simple explanation for this self-censure; it may be an aspect of the lover's pathological condition (if so, she is asked to excuse him: *ignosce timori*, 13); it may be the practical consideration that he stands to alienate and lose her by direct criticism (such as he directs against Romulus: *tu criminis auctor*, 19); it may be the observation that society influences our morals (*illa puellarum ingenuos corrupit ocellos*, 29); and it may be the generous impulse of the lover to undertake whatever obligation will spare hurting or pressuring his mistress (*semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris*, 42). Within the poem these are simply vague suggestions, and we are not expected to choose between them.

The speaker, for whatever reason,[119] repeatedly shifts blame from Cynthia to himself,[120] and the power of this poem derives from his being too much the victim of his conflicting emotions to know where blame truly belongs. This fundamental subjectivity, the inability to trust his own reactions to Cynthia's conduct,[121] is first clearly expressed in the opening section, in the disconnectedness of the

[117] Compare Boucher (n. 18) on lines 7–8: "l'expression ironique—qui voile l'inquiétude fondamentale—dérive du matériel de la comédie" (p. 430).

[118] On the earlier anticipation of this theme of marriage, see Williams (n. 59), p. 84.

[119] I have suggested several reasons, but all are psychological in the sense that they reveal the speaker's frame of mind. I therefore cannot agree with the conclusion of La Penna (n. 31): "invece che con l'accusa e con l'indignazione l'elegia si chiude con l'espressione patetica della dedizione: il passaggio da un polo all'altro avviene attraverso un lento processo in cui la componente retorico-discorsiva ha questa volta un'importanza maggiore di quello strettamente psicologica" (p. 231). Compare Hertzberg (n. 9): "Lyricum paene totum carmen est" (vol. 3, p. 103).

[120] A significant difference between this poem and 1. 3 is that here the speaker shifts blame onto himself (or men in general), while in 1. 3 he blames a third party: "It is the Gods, *Amor* and *Liber*, then, who are made to bear responsibility for the idea of the rape" (Lyne 1970 [n. 37], p. 70), and "at the last moment he blames, not Cynthia herself, but *sleep* [v.25] for the unresponsiveness of his loved one" (Lyne 1970, p. 72). This corresponds to the different kind of subjectivity presented in the two poems (see below).

[121] Compare Boucher's expression "l'inquiétude fondamentale," in note 117 above, and the discussion of Alfonsi 1945 (n. 17): "qui si tratta delle incertezze, degli abbandoni, delle riprese di un cuore dibattentesi tra posizioni opposte e discordanti" (p. 41).

exempla and their repudiation in the lines which follow. The subjective use of exempla at the beginning of this poem thus sets the tone and anticipates the structure of the whole elegy.[122]

Both of these poems begin with a series of mythological or legendary exempla which are used in a subjective manner. In the first poem these examples are used to suggest not an objective situation but the changing emotions and impressions of the drunken lover. The subjective nature of these impressions is emphasized by contrast with the objective presence of Cynthia. In the second poem the examples convey a condemnation which may (or may not) be simply a delusion of the infatuated lover. The subjective nature of this condemnation is emphasized by the contrast of implied assertion with extravagant repudiation. In both cases the subjectivity of the lover's experience is an important part of the poem as a whole. In the first his impressions are subjective in that they are (or seem to be) independent of the objective reality of his mistress. The comparison contained in the exempla is a subjective one. In the second his impressions are more fundamentally subjective in that there is (or seems to be) no way of deciding between contradictory impressions. The objective comparison contained in the exempla is contradicted by the speaker himself. The mythical and legendary exempla do not achieve their effect by alluding to external realms of truth or romance (though they may do these things as well); their effect is in the *manner* in which they are used, the suspension or disconnectedness which make the exempla—and the poem as a whole—a figure for the subjectivity of the lover's experience.[123]

North Carolina State University

[122] It is because this self-doubt, the assertion followed by contradiction, comes to structure the whole poem that "the cumulative effect of a series of abrupt transitions is almost overwhelming." But this effect is deliberate; it does not follow that "the sequence of thought is so far from clear that it is hard to resist the conviction that the text has been mutilated" (Butler and Barber, p. 200). Compare the observation by Hertzberg (n. 9): "Aestuantes huius elegiae affectus et transitus praeruptiores dubitationem criticis moverunt, an hic vel illic saeculorum iniuria mancus esset et turbatus versuum ordo. . . . Nec tamen absonum videatur totius dispositionis figuram proponere, quo rectius nexu sententiarum perspecto interpretari singulos locos liceat" (vol. 3, p. 103).

[123] Verstraete (n. 20) notes that "myth comes to assume, in the poet's mind, the emotional dimensions of his own experience. It is in the second book that this continual interpenetration of mythical and present reality may be most clearly felt" (p. 259). Although he does not discuss 2. 6 in any detail, his general observations are consonant with my own findings, and the differences I have noted between 1. 3 and 2. 6.